

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/715,724	09/19/96	WILSON	P	6000)
		IM22/0414		EXAMINER
KAREN M DEL		21100007 1000 200	JUSKA	, C
BASE CORPOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAND HILL R ENKA NC 287			1771	21
			DATE MAILED	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks



Advisory Action

Application No. 08/715,724

Applicant(s)

Wilson et al.

Examiner

Cheryl Juska

Group Art Unit 1771



ТНЕ	IE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]	
	a) expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
	expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.	!
	Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.	
	Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on	ny
Δn	oplicant's response to the final rejection, filed on <u>Mar 28, 2000</u> has been considered with the following it is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:	g effect,
_	The proposed amendment(s):	
	will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.	
	will not be entered because:	
	they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).	
	they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).	
	they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.	
	they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.	
	NOTE:	
		-
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):	
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):	
		ted in a
		ted in a
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submit separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.	
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submit separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in conditions allowables.	ition
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submit separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in cond for allowance because: the arguments are found unpersuasive. Mainly, the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertion that the Lin and	ition <i>Lijtin</i>
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submit separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in cond for allowance because: the arguments are found unpersuasive. Mainly, the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertion that the Lin and patents are diametrically opposed. Lin does not teach a dye-resistant sheath, but rather a stain-resistant sheath.	ition <i>Lijtin</i>
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submit separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in cond for allowance because: the arguments are found unpersuasive. Mainly, the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertion that the Lin and	ition <i>Lijtin</i>
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submit separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in cond for allowance because: the arguments are found unpersuasive. Mainly, the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertion that the Lin and patents are diametrically opposed. Lin does not teach a dye-resistant sheath, but rather a stain-resistant sheath. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised Examiner in the final rejection.	ition <i>Lijtin</i>
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submit separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in cond for allowance because: the arguments are found unpersuasive. Mainly, the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertion that the Lin and patents are diametrically opposed. Lin does not teach a dye-resistant sheath, but rather a stain-resistant sheath. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised Examiner in the final rejection.	ition <i>Lijtin</i>
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submit separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in cond for allowance because: the arguments are found unpersuasive. Mainly, the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertion that the Lin and patents are diametrically opposed. Lin does not teach a dye-resistant sheath, but rather a stain-resistant sheath. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims objected to:	Lijtin by the
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submit separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in cond for allowance because: the arguments are found unpersuasive. Mainly, the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertion that the Lin and patents are diametrically opposed. Lin does not teach a dye-resistant sheath, but rather a stain-resistant sheath. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims objected to: Claims rejected: 2-4, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 20, and 21	Lijtin by the
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submit separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in cond for allowance because: the arguments are found unpersuasive. Mainly, the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertion that the Lin and patents are diametrically opposed. Lin does not teach a dye-resistant sheath, but rather a stain-resistant sheath. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims objected to: Claims rejected: 2-4, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 20, and 21 The proposed drawing correction filed on hashas not been approved by the Exam	Lijtin by the
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submit separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in cond for allowance because: the arguments are found unpersuasive. Mainly, the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertion that the Lin and patents are diametrically opposed. Lin does not teach a dye-resistant sheath, but rather a stain-resistant sheath. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims objected to: Claims rejected: 2-4, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 20, and 21	Lijtin by the
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submit separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in cond for allowance because: the arguments are found unpersuasive. Mainly, the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertion that the Lin and patents are diametrically opposed. Lin does not teach a dve-resistant sheath, but rather a stain-resistant sheath. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims objected to: Claims rejected: 2-4, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 20, and 21 The proposed drawing correction filed on	Lijtin by the
	Newly proposed or amended claims	Lijtin by the
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submit separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in cond for allowance because: the arguments are found unpersuasive. Mainly, the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertion that the Lin and patents are diametrically opposed. Lin does not teach a dve-resistant sheath, but rather a stain-resistant sheath. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: Claims objected to: Claims rejected: 2-4, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 20, and 21 The proposed drawing correction filed on	Lijtin by the